

FILED - USDC -NH
2023 SEP 8 AM 10:58

8197

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Josephine Amatucci

v.

Greenhalgh, INDIVIDUALLY

Docket 1:20-cv-00340 LM

FURTHER RESPONSE TO COURTS FRAUDULENT MOTION
TO DISMISS CASE IN ITS ENTIRETY
RIGHTS TO A JURY TRIAL OF HER PEERS FOR DAMAGES
JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW

1. The decision and rulings by the Judges, in this case, is to dismiss this case in its..... ENTIRETY.....based only on the rulings and judgments made by defendant Greenhalgh after the Arraignment, during the court procedure, including the trial, but not before the trial when Greenhalgh refused to rule on the Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss, which was a denial of Due Process, in violation of her civil rights, where in denying her civil rights, Greenhalgh lost jurisdiction to rule and judge the case, and therefore any rulings and judgment he made after he refused to rule on her Motion to Dismiss which was before any court proceeding, before the Arraignment, his judgments are VOID OF

NO LEGAL FORCE.

2. That therefore this Courts decision to dismiss the case "Entirely" based on VOID JUDGMENTS is nothing less thanFRAUDULENT MISREPRESENTATION

3. The Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss was based on evidence proving that there was NO INJURY, and where the Complaint, for her malicious prosecution was based entirely on the fact that the Plaintiff caused an INJURY to the alleged victim Mr. Robert Maloney, and where everyone knew that Maloney made it very clearHE HAD NO INJURY, with this evidence Greenhalgh was MANDATED TO DISMISS THE CASE. Before the Arraignment. And in refusig to dismiss the case he violated her civil rights, which made him lose jurisdiction in the case which made any rulings and judgments Greenhalghn after the Arraignment, VOID OFNO LEGAL FORCE.

4. Which makes this Courts decision to dismiss this case in its 'ENTIRETY' based on VODI AND OF NO LEGAL FORCE rulings oF Greenhalghn', makes's this Courts decision to dismiss this case a decision tht isVOID OF NO LEGAL FORCE.

5, Therefore it is clear that this Courts judgments dismissing this case in its 'ENTIRETY' is nothing less than VOID OF NO LEGAL FORCE.....and FRAUDLENT MISREPRESENTATION.

6. This Court cannot dismiss a case based on VOID OF NO LEGAL FORCE judgments of Greenhalgh, who lost jurisdiction to rule on the case after he violated the Plaintiff's Civil Rights by refusing to rule on her Motion to Dismiss. A violation of Due Process, a violation of her liberty rights, an unawful seizure when she had to attend court hearings and a trial.

7. it appears that this Court is refusing to rule on the violation of her Civil Rights so that by dismissing the case in its ENTIRETY without ruling on the

violation of her civil rights, the courts purpose is to make it impossible for the Plaintiff to APPEAL the courts decision to dismiss the case, based on the violation of her civil rights, because if the Court did not address, or review, or discuss, or rule on her civil rights violations, THEY CANNOT BE APPEALED.

8. The Supreme Court of Louisiana held that a judge's ruling.... (in this case to refuse to rule on my Motion to Dismiss)... is found to violate the Code of Judicial Conduct- action contrary to CLEAR AND DETERMINED LAW, as the legal error was EGREGIOUS, made in bad faith. Clearly UNCONSTITUTIONAL, failing to follow and apply the law". A TRESPASSOR OF THE LAW.


9. Therefore, this Court is mandated under 1983 to allow the Plaintiff to proceed with a jury trial of her peers for damages, which it is clearly established that damages are allowed for the violation of one's civil rights, and where there was NO PROBABLE CAUSE for Greenhalgh to accuse the Plaintiff of an injury that never occurred, under the law the Plaintiff is allowed damages under 1983. For the violation of her Civil Rights by Greenhalgh acting in his INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY.

10. Or the judge would be violating theCode of Ethics..... as a trespassor of the law. And because the Plaintiff is very elderly, the court is mandated to allow her rights under the Sixth Amendment for a EXPEDITED SPEEDY TRIAL for damages..

Respectfully,

Josephine Amatucci

September 6, 2023

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Josephine Amatucci". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned below the typed name.

From: J. Amatore
P.O. Box 272
Wolfeboro Falls, N.H. 03896

Case 1:22-cv-00340-LM-AJ Document 13 Filed 09/08/23 Page 4 of 4

MANCHESTER NH 030

6 SEP 2023 19 1 L



United States District Court
DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
55 PLEASANT ST.
ROOM 110
CONCORD, N.H. 03301

03301-394135

